2 June 1981

How does PRIME differ from the process sponsored by OSD the last few years?

●   PRIME explicitly segregates judgments by both functional area and the mission being supported. By treating these in aggregate, the OSD method:

  -    required that large groups of people be involved in every session. PRIME permits smaller groups to focus on specific missions and functions--thus avoiding the confusion and awkwardness of large group participation,

  -    did not maintain an explicit audit of why packages were ranked as they were. By aggregating considerations across missions, insight as to how the rankings are influenced by different mission perspectives is lost.

●   PRIME solicits judgments from mission experts, not competing program sponsors (as was the case in the latest OSD effort). By using mission experts, the hope is that:

  -    judgments produced will be based more on the value of intelligence to the end user that intermediate, system builders, within the Community, and

  -    mission experts will be more objective in evaluating packages since they won't have to judge initiatives that compete directly against programs for which they are responsible.

●   PRIME provides for a written, overview paper designed to familiarize the participants with the packages they are evaluating and provide a common knowledge base for all participants. This should amelioriate the familiarity problems encountered in the OSD exercise.

●   The PRIME proposal explicitly describes how the results of the process will be used. One of the major criticisms of the OSD process was that the participants never saw a tangible product for their efforts. While we can make no guarantees on the amount of influence its results will have on final decisions:

  -    we are in a position to influence NFIP resources, and

  -    our proposal provides dates, formats, etc. of what PRIME will produce.